Integer Set Reduction for Stochastic Mixed-Integer Programming

Saravanan Venkatachalam and Lewis Ntaimo
Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Texas A&M University, 3131 TAMU, College Station, TX 77843, USA.
saravanan@tamu.edu,ntaimo@tamu.edu

arXiv:1605.05194v1 [math.OC] 29 Apr 2016

Abstract

Two-stage stochastic mixed-integer programming (SMIP) problems with general integer variables in the second-stage are generally difficult to solve. This paper develops the theory of integer set reduction for characterizing the subset of the convex hull of feasible integer points of the second-stage subproblem which can be used for solving the SMIP. The basic idea is to consider a small enough subset of feasible integer points that is necessary for generating a valid inequality for the integer subproblem. An algorithm for obtaining such a subset based on the solution of the subproblem LP-relaxation is then devised and incorporated into the Fenchel decomposition method for SMIP. To demonstrate the performance of the new integer set reduction methodology, a computational study based on randomly generated test instances was performed. The results of the study show that integer set reduction provides significant gains in terms of generating cuts faster leading to better bounds in solving SMIPs than using a direct solver.

Keywords: Stochastic programming, integer programming, integer set reduction, cutting planes, Fenchel decomposition, multidimensional knapsack.

1 Introduction

A two-stage stochastic mixed-integer programming (SMIP) problem involves optimizing the here-and-now (first-stage) costs plus expected future (second-stage) costs. Solving SMIP is still challenging and this paper makes strides towards that by introducing the theory of *integer set reduction* for characterizing *subsets* of the convex hull of feasible integer points of the second-stage subproblem that can be used to generate valid inequalities (cutting planes or cuts) for SMIP. The goal of integer set reduction is to speed up the cut generation routines and potentially lead to faster solution times for SMIP than direct solvers. In this paper we consider SMIP problems of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SIP2: Max} \quad & c^\top x + \mathcal{Q}_E(x) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & Ax \leq b \\ & x \in X. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

In problem SIP2, $x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}_+$ denotes the first-stage decision vector, $c \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1}$ is the first-stage cost vector, $b \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1}$ is the first-stage right hand side, and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times n_1}$ is the first-stage

constraint matrix. The set X imposes binary restrictions on all or some components of x. The function $\mathcal{Q}_E(x)$ denotes the expected second-stage cost based on x. The function $\mathcal{Q}_E(x)$ is the expected recourse function and is given as follows:

$$\mathcal{Q}_E(x) = \mathbb{E}_\omega \Phi(q(\omega), h(\omega) - T(\omega)x, \omega), \tag{2}$$

where $q(\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ is the cost vector, $h(\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2}$ is the right hand side vector, and $T(\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times n_1}$ is the technology matrix. The second-stage function Φ is a value function of a mixed-integer program (MIP) and is given as follows:

$$\Phi(\rho, \tau, \omega) = \text{Max } \{\rho^\top y(\omega) : Wy(\omega) \leq \tau, 0 \leq y(\omega) \leq u, y(\omega) \in Y\}. \tag{3}$$

In the second-stage (scenario) problem (3), $y(\omega)$ denotes the recourse decision vector and $W \in \mathbb{R}_+^{m_2 \times n_2}$ is the fixed recourse matrix. The vector $u \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{n_2}$ is the upper bound on the second-stage decision variables. It is assumed that $T(\omega) : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times n_1}$, $h(\omega) : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{m_2}$ and $q(\omega) : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{n_2}$ are measurable mappings defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. The set Y imposes integer restrictions on all or some components of $y(\omega)$. The function $\mathcal{Q}_E(x)$ is the expected recourse function, where ω is a realization of a multivariate random variable $\tilde{\omega}$, and $\mathbb{E}_\omega$ denotes the mathematical expectation operator.

We consider problem SIP2 under the following assumptions:

A1. The random variable $\tilde{\omega}$ is discrete with finitely many scenarios $\omega \in \Omega$, each with probability of occurrence $p(\omega)$ such that $\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} p_\omega = 1$.

A2. The first-stage feasible set $\{Ax \leq b, x \in X\}$ is nonempty.

A3. The right hand side vector τ and fixed-recourse matrix W are nonnegative, and W is rational.

A4. The second-stage feasible set $\{Wy(\omega) \leq \tau, 0 \leq y(\omega) \leq u, y(\omega) \in Y\}$ and is bounded and nonempty for all $x \in \{Ax \leq b, x \in X\}$.

Assumption (A1) is needed for tractability while assumptions (A2) and (A4) are needed to guarantee that the problem has an optimal solution. Assumption (A3) and (A4) are needed for the proposed integer set reduction method to allow for a well-defined problem and finite convergence of the cutting method. Assumption (A4) implies the relatively recourse assumption, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_\omega[\,|\Phi(q(\omega), h(\omega) - T(\omega)x), \omega|\,] < \infty$ for all $x \in \{Ax \leq b, x \in X\}$. Because of assumption (A1), SIP2 can be written in extensive form as a so-called deterministic equivalent problem (DEP) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DEP : Max } & c^\top x + \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} p_\omega q(\omega)^\top y(\omega) \\ \text{s.t. } & Ax \leq b \\ & T(\omega)x + Wy(\omega) \leq h(\omega) \\ & x \in X, y(\omega) \in Y. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

In the above formulation, p_ω denotes the probability of occurrence for the scenario ω, and $\sum p_{\omega \in \Omega} = 1$. Even for a reasonable number of scenarios in Ω, DEP is a large-scale MIP. With integer variables in both first and second-stages, a moderate sized DEP may be difficult to solve using a direct solver such as CPLEX [15]. This makes a decomposition approach a necessity for most practical sized problems. In SIP2, the type of decision variables (continuous, binary, integer) and in which stage they appear greatly influences algorithm design. The complexity of the solution method depends on the definitions of the sets X and Y. When both these sets do not impose integer restrictions on the decision variables, the recourse function $\Phi(\rho, \tau, \omega)$ is a well-behaved piecewise linear and convex function of x. Thus, Benders' decomposition [4] is applicable in this case [27] and the L-shaped method [25] can be used to solve the problems. Assuming fixed recourse (i.e, the recourse matrix W is independent of ω), the value function of $\Phi(\rho, \tau, \omega)$ is a piecewise linear function in x. Hence, the L-shaped method works by approximating the linear functions from the subproblems by constructing optimality cuts in the first-stage based on the dual values from the subproblems. However, when $Y \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, the linear approximation procedure by L-shaped method is not viable, as the value function is generally discontinuous and is lower semicontinuous [5]. Also, the function is non-convex and sub-additive [20]. Hence, new algorithms or extensions of the L-shaped method are required to handle integer variables in the second or in both of the stages.

Cutting plane methods that can partially approximate the second-stage problems within the L-shaped method have been proposed for SMIPs with integer variables in the second-stage. In [12], a lift-and-project cutting plane approach based on the ideas from [1] is used to solve problems with binary and continuous variables in both the first- and second-stage. In [21], for problems with binary variables in first-stage, and binary and continuous variables in second-stage, disjunctive cuts are developed for the second-stage. The work in [23] and [24] uses the framework of reformulation linearization technique. The algorithm in [21] is extended in [22] for problems with binary, continuous and discrete variables in the second-stage. Applications of SMIP in supply chain, air traffic control, and auto-carrier vehicle loading problems can be found at [3], [13], and [26], respectively.

Fenchel cuts are suggested in [9], and a number of characteristics are derived in [8], [10] and [11]. The most important results from [9], [10] and [11] are that Fenchel cutting planes are facet defining under certain conditions, and the use of Fenchel cuts in a cutting plane approach yields an algorithm with finite convergence. The work also highlights the fact that generating a Fenchel cut for binary programs is computationally expensive in general; therefore, problems with special structure are desirable to achieve faster convergence. Computational experiments demonstrating the effectiveness of Fenchel cuts are presented for knapsack polyhedra in [7] and for pure binary problems in [10].

Since the pioneering work in [9], only a few works in the literature have adopted Fenchel cuts. In [19], Fenchel cuts are used to improve the bounds obtained from MIPs using Lagrangian relaxation. Fenchel cuts are used to solve deterministic capacitated facility location problems [18]. This work compares Fenchel cuts to Lagrangian cuts in finding good relaxation bounds for their problem. In [6], Fenchel cutting planes are used for finding p median nodes in a graph using a cut and branch approach. Fenchel cuts are first derived

for two-stage SMIPs under a stage-wise decomposition setting in [17] and are referred to as Fenchel decomposition (FD) cuts. Extensive study of FD cuts for two-stage SMIP with binary decision variables in both first-stage and second-stages are given in [2] and [26].

This work makes the following contributions to the literature on stochastic programming: (a) deriving *integer set reduction* theory for determining subsets of the second-stage feasible integer set to use for faster cut generation; (b) devising an algorithm for obtaining such subsets based on the solution of the subproblem LP-relaxation; (c) applying the integer set reduction in the context of FD cuts for solving SMIPs with general integer variables in the second-stage; and (d) reporting on a computational study that demonstrates the advantages of integer set reduction. In the literature, Fenchel cuts and FD cuts are derived and used for MIP and SMIP, respectively, with binary variables. This work is the first to derive these cuts for MIP and SMIP with *general* integer variables.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Integer set reduction theory is derived in Section 2 and is applied to the FD setting for two-stage SMIP in Section 3. A computational study to illustrate the performance of the new methodology is reported in Section 4. Finally, conclusions and directions for future research are given in Section 5.

2 Integer Set Reduction for Cut Generation

In this section we develop the integer set reduction theory to characterize the properties of the convex hull of integer points needed for generating a valid inequality for the second-stage feasible set. We then use the theory to devise an algorithm for obtaining a reduced set of integer points needed for generating a valid inequality based on the second-stage LP-relaxation. To illustrate the concepts, we use simple numerical examples. Next we start with some preliminaries.

2.1 Preliminaries

We will now provide some important definitions needed in the derivation of a valid inequality for SIP2 with general integer variables in the second-stage. Suppressing ω for simplicity in exposition, the feasible set for the second-stage subproblem (3) can be given as follows:

$$F^{IP} = \{y : Wy \leq \tau, 0 \leq y \leq u, y \in Y\}. \tag{5}$$

Thus subproblem (3) can now be rewritten as

$$\text{Max } \{\rho^\top y : y \in F^{IP}\}. \tag{6}$$

The LP-relaxation feasible set to F^{IP} can be expressed as

$$F^{LP} = \{y : Wy \leq \tau, 0 \leq y \leq u, y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}_+\}$$

and the LP-relaxation to (6) given as

$$\text{Max } \{\rho^\top y : y \in F^{LP}\}. \tag{7}$$

We shall denote by $C(F^{IP})$ the convex hull of integer points in F^{IP}. Let $F_v^{IP} \subseteq F^{IP}$ and $C(F_v^{IP})$ will denote the convex hull of integer points in F_v^{IP}.

Now let $\hat{y} \in F^{LP}$ be the optimal solution to subproblem (7) for a given $x \in \{Ax \leq b, x \in X\}$. Our goal is to use the point $\hat{y}$ and restrict the derivation of valid inequalities (cuts) to a relatively small subset of integer points F_v^{IP} instead of F^{IP} so that a generated cut valid for $C(F_v^{IP})$ is valid for $C(F^{IP})$ and cuts off $\hat{y}$. The hope is that doing so would result in reduced cut generation computational time, thus leading to fast cutting plane methods for SIP2. Therefore, it is desirable to have $F_v^{IP} \subset F^{IP}$ such that $|F_v^{IP}| << |F^{IP}|$ so that generating cuts over F_v^{IP} is not expensive.

DEFINITION 2.1. An inequality is said to be *valid* for the set $C(F^{IP})$ if it is satisfied by every point in the set. A cut with respect to a point $\hat{y} \notin C(F^{IP})$ is a valid inequality for $C(F^{IP})$ that is violated by $\hat{y}$.



Figure 1: Separation problem with reduced integer feasible set

Generating a valid inequality using the subset F_v^{IP} is depicted in Figure 1. In the figure, given $\hat{y} \in F^{LP}$, the three points defining the triangle constitute F_v^{IP} and are used to generate the cut (dashed lines) of the form $\pi^\top y \leq \pi_0$. We devise a methodology to obtain F_v^{IP}, and subsequently use it to generate a valid inequality. Also, since $F_v^{IP} \subseteq F^{IP}$, we need to form F_v^{IP} such that the generated valid inequality does not cut off any integer points in F^{IP}.

In subproblem (3), the general integer variable vector y is bounded by the vector u. Let I be the set of indices of the components of y which are integer variables, and K be the set of indices of the constraints in (3). Also, let the elements of the matrix W be denoted by w_{kt}, where $k \in K$ is the constraint index, and $t \in I$ is the decision variable index. We also make the following assumption regarding W:

A5. The polytope defined by $C(F^{IP})$ is assumed to be full dimensional with dimension n_2.

Let P be an index set for integer points in F^{IP} such that for $p \in P$ we have an integer point $y^p \in F^{IP}$. The i^{th} component of y^p will be denoted y_i^p. In Figure 1, for example, the integer point $y^p = (3, 2)$ has components $y_1^p = 3$ and $y_2^p = 2$. Let y^{IP} be the optimal solution to (3) and $\hat{y}$ be the optimal solution to the LP-relaxation. Also, define $\bar{y} = \lfloor \hat{y} \rfloor$ so that the components $\bar{y}_i$, for all $i = 1, \cdots, n_2$ are initialized as $\bar{y}_i = \lfloor \hat{y}_i \rfloor$. Let d_{ij}^p denote the distance from y^p to the boundary of F^{LP} along the y_j^p axis for all $i, j \in I, i \neq j$. Then d_{ij}^p can be calculated as follows:

$$d_{ij}^p = \min \left\{ \left(\left[\tau_k - \sum_{t \in I: t \neq i, t \neq j} w_{kt} \hat{y}_t - w_{ki} \bar{y}_i \right] / w_{kj} \right)_{\forall k \in K} - y_j^p,\ u_j - y_j^p \right\}, \tag{8}$$

where τ_k is the right hand side for constraint $k \in K$, and u_j is the upper bound for axis j. For each y_i^p axis, $i = 1, \cdots, n_2$, let $f_i(y^p)$ be the shortest distance from y^p to the boundary of F^{LP} along the y_j^p axis, $i \neq j$. Then $f_i(y^p)$ can be calculated as follows:

$$f_i(y^p) = \min_{j \in I,\ i \neq j} \left\{ d_{ij}^p \right\}. \tag{9}$$

For each y_i^p axis, $i = 1, \cdots, n_2$, let $f_i'(y^p)$ be the shortest distance from y^p to the boundary of F^{LP} along the y_i^p axis. Then $f_i'(y^p)$ can be calculated as follows:

$$f_i'(y^p) = \min_{j \in I,\ i \neq j} \left\{ d_{ji}^p \right\}. \tag{10}$$

Next, we establish that there exists a set $F_v^{IP} \subseteq F^{IP}$, which is sufficient for generating a valid inequality for F^{IP}.

LEMMA 2.2. *Given F^{IP}, there exists a set $F_v^{IP} \subseteq F^{IP}$ such that F_v^{IP} is sufficient for generating a valid inequality for F^{IP}.*

Proof. Given F^{IP}, then either $F_v^{IP} = F^{IP}$ or $F_v^{IP} \subset F^{IP}$. For $F_v^{IP} = F^{IP}$, it is obvious that entire set F^{IP} can be used for generating a valid inequality to cut off a fractional point $\hat{y}$. Now consider the case $F_v^{IP} \subset F^{IP}$. $|F^{IP}| \geq n_2 + 1$ as $C(F^{IP})$ is full dimensional by assumption (A5). To generate a valid inequality, $|F_v^{IP}| \geq n_2$, as n_2 affinely independent integer points are needed to construct a facet for $C(F^{IP})$. Then F_v^{IP} can be constructed such that there exists an integer point $y^{p'} \notin F_v^{IP}$ and $y^{p'} \in F^{IP}$. Hence, $|F^{IP}| > |F_v^{IP}|$ which gives $F_v^{IP} \subset F^{IP}$. □

We state the required properties for an integer point $y^p \in F_v^{IP}$ in the following corollary.

COROLLARY 2.3. *Let $y^p \in F_v^{IP}$. Then either of the following must be true:*

(i) $d_{ij}^p < 1$, $\forall i, j \in I | j \neq i$ or

(ii) $d_{ij}^p \geq 1$ *and any integer point* $y^{p'} \in F^{IP}$ *such that* $y_i^{p'} - y_i^p \geq 1, \forall i \in I$ *for at least one index* $i \in I$ *also belongs to* F_v^{IP}.

When $d_{ij}^p < 1$, then there does not exist an integer point $y_i^p \in F^{IP}$. Alternatively, when $d_{ij}^p \geq 1$, then there exists an integer point $y_i^{p'} \in F^{IP}$ such that $d_{ij}^p > d_{ij}^{p'}$. This means that there is an integer point $y_i^{p'}$ between y_i^p and the boundary of F^{LP}. Since $y_i^p < y_i^{p'}$ and $y_i^p, y_i^{p'} > 0$, it implies that $d_{ij}^p - y_i^p > d_{ij}^p - y_i^{p'}$ and $y_i^{p'} - y_i^p > 0$. This means that $y_i^{p'} - y_i^p \geq 1$ since $y_i^{p'}, y_i^p \in F^{IP}$. However by *(ii)*, if $d_{ij}^p \geq 1$ and $y_i^{p'} - y_i^p \geq 1, \forall i \in I$, then the point $y^{p'} \in F_v^{IP}$.

In Corollary 2.3, we simply state the properties for the integer points that define the set F_v^{IP}. However, it is desirable to get the smallest possible set F_v^{IP} such that the valid inequality generated based on F_v^{IP} does not cut off any (optimal) integer point in F^{IP}. We evaluate each of the components of y and add an integer point y^p to the set F_v^{IP} if it is the closest integer point to $\hat{y}$ for that component, or if all other integer points between y^p and the boundary of F^{LP} are already in the set F_v^{IP}.

In the following lemma, we state the requirements for the minimum cardinality for the set F_v^{IP}. Ideally, we would like the set F_v^{IP} to have a small number of integer points since generating a cut based on $C(F^{IP})$ may be computationally expensive.

LEMMA 2.4. *Given* F_v^{IP} *and the set* $D_i = Argmin_{y^p} \{f_i(y^p) \mid y^p \in F^{IP}, y_i^p > 0\}$ *there exists an integer point* $y' \in F_v^{IP}$ *for every* $i \in I$ *such that*

$$y' = \underset{y^k}{argmin} \{f_i'(y^k) \mid y^k \in D_i\}.$$

Proof. We prove this result by contradiction. Suppose that the point $y' \in F_v^{IP}$ does not exist. Then this means that a valid inequality would pass through the origin. This implies that $C(F^{IP})$ is not full dimensional, which is a contradiction due to assumption (A5). Hence, there exists a point y' for each axis i. □

PROPOSITION 2.5. *The minimum cardinality of the set* F_v^{IP} *is* n_2.

Proof. By Lemma 2.4, there should be at least one integer point for every component $i \in I$. This implies that $|I| = n_2$. Also, since valid inequalities are facets, then we need at least n_2 affinely independent points in the set F_v^{IP} for generating the facet. □

2.2 Integer Set Generation Algorithm

Based on Lemma 2.4 and Proposition 2.5, $\left|F_v^{IP}\right| = n_2$ since subproblem (3) is full dimensional. However, getting the smallest set is not trivial unless we have an oracle providing an ideal interior point $y^p \in F^{IP}$, on which the smallest set F_v^{IP} can be constructed. In the next section, we devise an algorithm to obtain the set F_v^{IP} using Corollary 2.3, Lemma 2.4, and Proposition 2.5. In the algorithm, we start with an initial point $y^p \in F_v^{IP}$, where y^p

is constructed based on $\hat{y}$. Corollary 2.3 and Lemma 2.4 are used to check whether the set of points in F_v^{IP} are sufficient for generating a valid inequality, if not then the set F_v^{IP} is expanded by sequentially adding integer points from the set F^{IP}. An algorithm for obtaining the set F_v^{IP} can be stated as follows:

Algorithm 1 Integer Set Generation (ISG) Procedure

Step [1] Initialize: Let $\bar{y}$ be the lower bound of the variables in (3), and initialized as $\bar{y}_i = \lfloor \hat{y}_i \rfloor$, $\forall i = 1 \dots n_2$. Let $K' \subseteq K$ be the subset of indices for the binding constraints at current solution $\hat{y}$. Let I be the set of variable indices, and K be the set of constraint indices for (3).
Step [2] Compute Distance d_{ij}:
for $i \in I$ **do**
  for $j \in I \setminus i$ **do**
    $d_{ij} = 0, f_k = 0$
    for $k \in K'$ **do**
      (a) *Assign righthand side for constraint index k:*
      $f_k \leftarrow \tau_k$
      (b) *Projections for all other indices except indices i and j:*
      for $t \in I \setminus \{i, j\}$ **do**
        $f_k \leftarrow f_k - w_{kt}\hat{y}_t$
      end for
      (c) *Compute Distance:*
      $r_k \leftarrow f_k - w_{ki}\bar{y}_i$
      $d_{ij} \leftarrow \min\{r_k/w_{kj}, u_j\}$
    end for
  end for
end for

Step [3] Evaluate Bounds:
for all $i \in I$ **do**
  for all $j \in I \setminus i$ **do**
    for all $k \in K'$ **do**
      $z = 0$
      repeat
        $\alpha = 0$
        (d) *Evaluate* d_{ij}*:*
        if $(d_{ij} < 1)$ & $\bar{y}_i \geq 1$ **then**
          $\bar{y}_i \leftarrow \bar{y}_i - 1$; $\alpha = 1$;
        else if $d_{ij} - \bar{y}_j < 1$ & $\bar{y}_j \geq 1$ **then**
          $\bar{y}_j \leftarrow \bar{y}_j - 1$; $\alpha = 1$;
        end if
        (e) *Check for Integer Points:*
        $b \leftarrow 1$
        while $\bar{y}_i - b > 0$ & $\alpha = 0$ **do**
          $r_k^{(1)} \leftarrow f_k - w_{ki}(\bar{y}_i - b)$; $d_{ij}^{(1)} \leftarrow r_k^{(1)}/w_{kj}$;
          if $(\lfloor d_{ij}^{(1)} \rfloor - \lfloor d_{ij} \rfloor \geq 1)$ & $(\lfloor d_{ij}^{(1)} \rfloor \leq u_i)$ **then**
            $\bar{y}_i \leftarrow \bar{y}_i - b$; $\alpha = 1$;
          end if
          $b \leftarrow b + 1$;
        end while
        if $\alpha = 1$ **then**
          Re-evaluate d_{ij} using the Step [2c];
        end if
        $z \leftarrow z + 1$;
      until $\alpha = 0$
    end for
  end for
end for
Step [4] Use the computed lower bound $\bar{y}_i$ for the variable index $i \in I$ in FCG.

In Algorithm 1, we initialize $\bar{y}_i = \lfloor \hat{y}_i \rfloor$ to obtain the set F_v^{IP}. In each iteration, we evaluate two components of y along i and j, and the lower bounds for the components are decreased based on the distance of the components from the binding constraints. Each pair of components, y_i and y_j are evaluated in two-dimensional (2D) space. The pair of components (y_i, y_j) are evaluated in the 2D space with the criterion that $\bar{y}_i$ and $\bar{y}_j$ provide at least one integer point for the generation of the valid inequality in i^{th} direction. We also make sure that $\bar{y}_i$ and $\bar{y}_j$ does not remove any integer point in $C(F^{IP})$ so that the generated valid inequality does not cut off any optimal solution.

In Step [1], we initialize the parameters using LP-relaxation solution for subproblem (3) given as $\hat{y}_i$ for $i \in I$, where I is the set of decision variable indices. Furthermore, $\bar{y}_i$ is the parameter of the algorithm which we intend to use as lower bound for the i^{th} component in the subproblem (3). We would like to *increase* the value of $\bar{y}_i$ without cutting off any

integer solution for the original problem. Initially $\bar{y}_i$ is set to $\lfloor \hat{y}_i \rfloor$. In Step [2a], the right hand side of binding constraint $k \in K'$ is assigned to parameter f_k. In Step [2b], for any $i, j \in I$, such that $i \neq j$, we calculate the distance d_{ij} in (i, j) space using equation (8). We then evaluate d_{ij} in Step [2c]. The parameter d_{ij} is the measure of distance from the other component's axis to the binding constraint. If $d_{ij} < 1$, then it indicates the absence of an integer point along i^{th} axis, then $\bar{y}_i$ is decreased by one, and $\bar{y}$ will be evaluated again for the binding constraint k using the expanded set F_v^{IP}. Hence, we start with a smallest set of integers based on $\lfloor \hat{y}_i \rfloor$, and as the algorithm progresses, the set F_v^{IP} is expanded by decreasing $\bar{y}$ based on Corollary 2.3 and Lemma 2.4.



Figure 2: Illustration of ISG algorithm

In step [3d], we check property *(ii)* of Corollary 2.3. If there are any integer points along the component i, then $\bar{y}_i$ is reduced to accommodate additional integer points into the set F_v^{IP}. We make sure that the reduced set $C(F_v^{IP})$ is sufficient to get the required valid inequality. The complexity of the algorithm is $\mathrm{O}(n^3 m)$, where n is the number of variables, and m is the number of constraints. The 2D construction from the entire polytope is similar to variable elimination method described in [14].

2.3 Numerical Examples

In this section, we demonstrate the ISG algorithm using numerical examples. In Example 1, we use an IP subproblem with two decision variables and one constraint to illustrate the generation of a reduced integer set using the ISG algorithm. Example 2 demonstrates the algorithm for a subproblem with two decision variables and two constraints. In both Example 1 and 2, Step[3e] of the ISG algorithm is not required, therefore we use Example 3 to demonstrate the significance of this step.

Example 1: Consider the following IP subproblem:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IP1: Max } & y_1 + y_2 \\ \text{s.t. } & 0.4y_1 + y_2 \leq 3.4 \\ & 0 \leq y_1, y_2 \leq 3 \\ & y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{Z}, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The LP-relaxation to the problem (11) has the optimal solution (3, 2.2). Thus, a valid inequality has to cut off the fractional solution. The steps of Algorithm 1 are as follows:

Step [1] Initialize: $y^p = (\lfloor 3 \rfloor, \lfloor 2.2 \rfloor) = (3, 2)$. Therefore, $y_1^p = 3$, $y_2^p = 2$, $\bar{y}_1 = 3$, $\bar{y}_2 = 2$, based on $\hat{y_1} = 3$ and $\hat{y_2} = 2.2$.

Step [2] Compute Distance d_{12}^p: $i = 1, j = 2, k = 1$,
$r_1 = 3.4 - 0.4(3) = 2.2$. $d_{12}^p = \min\{2.2/1 - y_2^p, 3 - y_2^p\} = 0.2$.

Step [3] Evaluate Bounds:
$z = 0, i = 1$:
$d_{12}^p < 1 \Rightarrow \bar{y}_1 = \bar{y}_1 - 1 = 3 - 1 = 2$, update $y^p \Leftarrow (2, 2)$, and $\alpha = 1$.
Since $\alpha = 1$, Re-evaluate d_{12}^p: $r_1 = 3.4 - 0.4(2) = 2.6$. $d_{12}^p = \min\{2.6/1 - y_2^p, 3 - y_2^p\} = 0.6$.
$z = 1, i = 1$:
$d_{12}^p < 1 \Rightarrow \bar{y}_1 = \bar{y}_1 - 1 = 2 - 1 = 1$, update $y^p \Leftarrow (1, 2)$, and $\alpha = 1$.
Since $\alpha = 1$, Re-evaluate d_{12}^p: $r_1 = 3.4 - 0.4(1) = 3.0$. $d_{12}^p = \min\{3.0/1 - y_2^p, 3 - y_2^p\} = 1.0$.
$z = 2, i = 1$:
$d_{12}^p \geq 1$, then evaluate the next component $\bar{y}_2$.
$\bar{y}_2 = 2$, $r_1 = 3.4 - 2 = 1.4$.
$d_{21}^p = \min\{1.4/0.4 - y_1^p, 3 - y_1^p\} = \min\{3.5 - y_1^p, 3 - y_1^p\} = 2$.
$z = 0, i = 2$:
Since $d_{21}^p \geq 1$, we do not make any changes to $\bar{y}_2$.

Step [4] New Lower Bounds: $y_1 = 1$ and $y_2 = 2$.

The value $d_{12}^p = 0.2$ represents the distance between the point $y^p(3, 2)$ and the point $y^p(3, 2.2)$ for a binding constraint in the y_2 direction. Since there is no integer point in the direction, the algorithm iterates to reach the point $y^{p'}(2, 2)$, where the distance $d_{12}^{p'} = \min\left\{2.6/1 - y_2^{p'}, 3 - y_2^{p'}\right\} = 0.6$. The value '0.6' is the distance between the point $y^{p'}(2, 2)$ and the binding constraint in $y_2^{p'}$ direction. Since $d_{12}^{p'} < 1$, the algorithm is continued to next iteration. The value $d_{12}^{p''} = \min\left\{3/1 - y_2^{p''}, 3 - y_2^{p''}\right\} = 1$ is the distance between the point $y^{p''}(1, 2)$ and the binding constraint at the point $y^{p''}(1, 2)$.

The feasible set based on the new point $(1, 2)$ as the origin is depicted in Figure 3-(a). The reduced feasible set is now used for the generation of a cut, which is depicted in Figure 3-(b).



Figure 3: Example 1 illustration: (a) reduced integer set and (b) cut generated based on the reduced set

Example 2: Consider the following IP subproblem:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{IP2: Max } & y_1 + y_2 && \text{(12a)}\\
\text{s.t. } & 0.4y_1 + y_2 \leq 3.4 && \text{(12b)}\\
& y_1 + 0.4y_2 \leq 3.4 && \text{(12c)}\\
& 0 \leq y_1, y_2 \leq 3 && \text{(12d)}\\
& y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{Z}, && \text{(12e)}
\end{aligned}$$

The LP-relaxation to the problem (12) has the optimal solution (2.42, 2.42). Thus, a valid inequality has to cut off the fractional solution. The steps of Algorithm 1 are as follows:

Step [1] Initialize: $y^p = (\lfloor 2.42 \rfloor, \lfloor 2.42 \rfloor) = (2, 2)$. Therefore, $y_1^p = 2$, $y_2^p = 2$, $\bar{y}_1 = 2$, $\bar{y}_2 = 2$, based on $\hat{y}_1 = 2.42$ and $\hat{y}_2 = 2.42$.

Step [2] Compute Distance :
$i = 1, j = 2, k = 1$,
$r_1 = 3.4 - 0.4(2) = 2.6$. $d_{12}^p = \min\{2.6/1 - y_2^p, 3 - y_2^p\} = 0.6$.

Step [3] Evaluate Bounds :
$z = 0, i = 1, k = 1$:
$d_{12}^p < 1 \Rightarrow \bar{y}_1 = \bar{y}_1 - 1 = 2 - 1 = 1$, update $y^p \Leftarrow (1, 2)$, and $\alpha = 1$.
Since $\alpha = 1$, Re-evaluate d_{12}^p: $r_1 = 3.4 - 0.4(1) = 3.0$. $d_{12}^p = \min\{3.0/1 - y_2^p, 3 - y_2^p\} = 1.0$.
$z = 1, i = 1, k = 1$:
$d_{12}^p \geq 1$, then evaluate the next constraint.
$i = 1, j = 2, k = 2$,

$r_2 = 3.4 - 1 = 2.4$. $d_{12}^p = \min\{2.4/0.4 - y_2^p, 3 - y_2^p\} = 1.0$.
$z = 0, i = 1, k = 2$:
$d_{12}^p \geq 1$, and all the constraints are evaluated, so we move to the next component $\bar{y}_2$.
$z = 0, i = 2, j = 1, k = 1$,
Similarly, for $\bar{y}_2 = 2$, $r_1 = 3.4 - 2 = 1.4$.
$d_{21}^p = \min\{1.4/0.4 - y_1^p, 3 - y_1^p\} = \min\{3.5 - y_1^p, 3 - y_1^p\} = 2$.
$d_{21}^p \geq 1$, then evaluate the next constraint.
$z = 0, i = 2, j = 1, k = 2$,
$r_2 = 3.4 - 0.4(2) = 2.6$.
$d_{21}^p = \min\{2.6/1.0 - y_1^p, 3 - y_1^p\} = \min\{2.6 - y_1^p, 3 - y_1^p\} = 1.6$.
Since $d_{21}^p \geq 1$, we don't make any changes to y_2.

Step [4] New Lower Bounds: $y_1 = 1$ and $y_2 = 2$.

The value $d_{12}^p = 0.6$ represents the distance between the point $y^p(2, 2)$ and the point $y^p(2, 2.6)$ for the binding constraint (12b) in y_2 component's direction. Since there is no integer point in the direction, the algorithm iterates to reach the point $y^{p'}(1, 2)$, where the distance $d_{12}^{p'} = \min\left\{3.0/1 - y_2^{p'}, 3 - y_2^{p'}\right\} = 1.0$. The value '1.0' is the distance between the point $y^{p'}(1, 2)$ and the binding constraint (12b) in $y_2^{p'}$ direction. Since $d_{12}^{p'} \geq 1$, the algorithm considers the next constraint. Similarly, the other index y_2 is evaluated in y_1's directions for both the constraints (12b) and (12c).

The feasible set based on the new origin $(1, 2)$ is depicted in Figure 4-(a). The feasible set is used for the generation of valid inequalities, and the generated cut is shown in Figure 4-(b). After performing to the ISG algorithm, the new origin is (1, 2).



Figure 4: Example 2 illustration: (a) reduced integer set and (b) cut generated based on the reduced set

Example 3: Consider another IP subproblem given as follows::

$$\begin{aligned} \text{IP3: Max } & 1.2y_1 + 3.4y_2 \\ \text{s.t. } & 6y_1 + 5y_2 \leq 37.4 \\ & 0 \leq y_1, y_2 \leq 5 \\ & y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{Z}, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The LP-relaxation for problem (13) gives the solution $(5, 1.48)$. Using Step [3d] of the ISG algorithm, the new origin for FCG procedure is shifted to $(4, 0)$. However, based on F_v^{IP}, the generated valid inequality removes an integer point $(2, 5)$ from the solution space. Hence, we use Step [3e] to prevent any possibility of removing off integer points from the solution space based on the current reference obtained from step [3d]. Thus Step [3e] gives the new reference $(2, 0)$ based on the possible integer points in F^{IP}. The reduced solution space based on the new origin $(4, 0)$ without Step (e) is shown in Figure 5-(a). The reduced solution space based on Step [e] for the generation of a valid inequalities is shown in Figure 5-(b).



Figure 5: Example 3 illustration: (a) reduced integer set and (b) cut generated based on the reduced set

The newly computed lower bounds from ISG algorithm will be used for the generation of valid inequalities. The objective of ISG algorithm is to obtain a smaller reduced set $F_v^{IP} \subseteq F^{IP}$ which further gives $C(F_v^{IP}) \subseteq C(F^{IP})$. A reduced set F_v^{IP} is expected to provide better runtime for the generation of a valid inequality.

3 Fenchel Decomposition Algorithm

To demonstrate how to use the ISG method within an SMIP algorithm, we will apply this method to stage-wise Fenchel decomposition (SFD) for solving SMIPs [16]. SFD adopts

the Benders' decomposition setting with x as the first-stage decision variable in the master problem, and $y(\omega)$ as the second-stage decision variable in the subproblem. In SIP2, instead of working with the IP subproblem directly, SFD seeks to find the optimal solution via a cutting plane approach on a partial LP-relaxation of SIP2 where only the subproblems are relaxed. Fenchel decomposition (FD) cuts are sequentially generated to recover (at least partially) the convex hull of integer points for each scenario subproblem feasible set. If a subproblem LP has a non-integer solution, an FD is generated and added to cut off the fractional solution. FD cuts are capable of recovering faces of the convex hull of integer programs, which is the special structure for SIP2. The goal is to construct the convex hull of integer points in the neighborhood of the optimal solution so that by solving subproblem LPs with sufficient FD cuts added, we can find the optimal solution without having to resort to a branch-and-bound scheme to guarantee optimality.

3.1 Algorithm

At a given iteration k of the SFD cutting plane algorithm, the master problem takes the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} z^k = \text{Max} \;\; & c^\top x + \theta \\ \text{s.t.} \;\; & Ax \leq b \\ & (\eta^t)^\top x + \theta \geq \gamma^t, \; t \in 1, ..., k \qquad (14a) \\ & x \in \{0, 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

In the master problem (14), θ is the optimality cut decision variable, $\eta \in \Re^{n1}$ is the optimality cut coefficient vector, and $\gamma \in \Re$ is the right hand side. Constraints (14a) are the *optimality* cuts, which are computed based on the optimal dual solutions of all the LP-relaxation subproblems. Optimality cuts approximate the value function of the second-stage subproblems. For a first-stage solution x^k from the master problem (14), the subproblem for each scenario $\omega \in \Omega$ is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SP}(\omega) : \Phi^k_{LP}(\rho, \tau, \omega) = \text{Max} \;\; & \rho^\top y(\omega) \\ \text{s.t.} \;\; & Wy(\omega) \leq \tau \\ & \beta^t(\omega)^\top y(\omega) \leq g(\omega, \beta^t(\omega)), \; t \in \Theta(\omega) \qquad (15a) \\ & 0 \leq y(\omega) \leq u \\ & y(\omega) \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Constraints (15a) are the Fenchel cuts, and $\Theta(\omega)$ is the index set for algorithm iterations at which a Fenchel cut is generated for each $\omega \in \Omega$. Next, we describe how these cuts are generated.

The SFD algorithm starts by initializing data in Step [1] and getting an initial solution by solving the LP-relaxation of SIP2 in Step [2]. If the initial solution satisfies the integrality restrictions for all subproblems in Step [3], i.e., $x \in X$ and $y(\omega) \in Y, \forall\, \omega \in \Omega$, then the

solution is declared ϵ-optimal, and the algorithm terminates. Otherwise, the algorithm continues by calculating and storing the optimality cut coefficients for all subproblems with an integer solution in Step [4].

Algorithm 2 Stage-Wise Fenchel Decomposition (SFD) Algorithm

Step [1] Initialization: set $k \leftarrow 0, \epsilon > 0, LB \leftarrow -\infty$ and $UB \leftarrow \infty$.
Step [2] Get initial solution: Solve problem (14-15) using the L-shaped algorithm to get solution $(\hat{x}^0, \hat{y}^0(\omega))$, objective function value $\varphi^0 = \sum_{\omega\in\Omega} p_\omega \Phi^k_{LP}(\rho, \tau, \omega)$, and dual solutions $\hat{\pi}^k(\omega)$ for each $\omega \in \Omega$.
Step [3] Check solution integrality:
if $\hat{y}^k(\omega) \in Y$ **then**
  Report $(\hat{x}^k, \hat{y}^k(\omega))$ as optimal.
  Stop.
end if
Step [4] Calculate and store optimality cuts coefficients for scenarios with integer solution
for $\omega \in \Omega$ **do**
  if $\hat{y}(\omega)^k \in Y$ **then**
    Calculate and store optimality cut coefficients $\eta(\omega)^k \leftarrow \hat{\pi}(\omega)^{k\top} T(\omega)$ and $\gamma(\omega)^k \leftarrow \hat{\pi}(\omega)^{k\top} h(\omega)$.
  end if
end for
Step [5] Fenchel cuts and optimality cuts generation:
for $\omega \in \Omega$ **do**
  if $\hat{y}(\omega)^k \notin Y$ **then**
    Compute scenario Fenchel cut coefficients: Run ISG to get F_υ^{IP} and use FCG based on F_υ^{IP} to get $\beta(\omega)^k$ and $g(\omega, \beta(\omega)^k)$.
    Add the cut $\beta(\omega)^{k\top} y(\omega) \leq g(\omega, \beta(\omega)^k)$ to subproblem (15).
    Solve the updated subproblem SP(ω) and get updated subproblem dual solution $\hat{\pi}(\omega)^k$.
    Update optimality cut coefficients $\eta^k \leftarrow \eta^k + p_\omega \cdot (\hat{\pi}(\omega)^k)^\top T(\omega)$ and $\gamma^k \leftarrow \gamma^k + p_\omega \cdot (\hat{\pi}(\omega)^k)^\top h(\omega)$.
  end if
end for

Step [6] Add optimality cut $\eta^k x + \theta \geq \gamma^k$ to master problem (14) and update iterator: set $k \leftarrow k + 1$.
Step [7] Solve master problem (14) to get a new first-stage solution $\hat{x}^k$ and objective value z^k.
Step [8] Update lower bound: Set $LB \leftarrow max\{LB, z^k\}$
Step [9] ϵ-optimality check:
if $|UB - LB| \leq \epsilon |LB|$ **then**
  Go to Step [14].
end if
Step [10] Solve subproblems:
for $\omega \in \Omega$ **do**
  Solve subproblem (15) to get updated subproblem solution $\hat{y}(\omega)^k$, optimal value $\Phi^k_{LP}(\rho, \tau, \omega)$ and dual solution $\hat{\pi}(\omega)^k$.
  if $\hat{y}(\omega)^k \in Y$ **then**
    Calculate and store optimality cut coefficients $\eta(\omega)^k \leftarrow \hat{\pi}(\omega)^{k\top} T(\omega)$ and $\gamma(\omega)^k \leftarrow \hat{\pi}(\omega)^{k\top} h(\omega)$.
  end if
end for
Step [11] Subproblem solutions integrality check:
for $\omega \in \Omega$ **do**
  if $y(\omega)^k \notin Y$ **then**
    Go to Step [5].
  end if
end for
Step [12] Update solution and bound information:
  Update incumbent solution: $x^* \leftarrow x^k$.
  Update upper bound: $UB \leftarrow min\{UB, c^\top x^k + \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} p_\omega \Phi^k_{LP}(\rho, \tau, \omega)\}$.
Step [13] ϵ-optimality check:
if $|UB - LB| > \epsilon |LB|$ **then**
  Go to Step [6].
end if
Step [14] Declare x^* ϵ-optimal.
Stop.

For subproblems with a solution that does not satisfy the integrality requirements, Fenchel cut coefficients $\beta^k(\omega)$, and the right hand side $g(\omega, \beta^k(\omega))$ are computed for the iteration k in Step [5]. A Fenchel cut is added to subproblem SP(ω). Next, the dual solution obtained by solving the subproblem is used to generate the optimality cut coefficients. Once all subproblems have been solved at a given iteration, the optimality cut is added to the master problem in Step [6]. The iteration counter k is incremented by one, and the master problem is solved again in Step [7] to get an updated first-stage solution and objective value.

The lower bound LB is updated in Step [8]. The gap between the lower bound LB and the upper bound UB is verified in Step [9]. If this gap is small enough, then the incumbent solution is declared ϵ-optimal in Step [14], and then the algorithm terminates. Otherwise, all the subproblems are solved again, and optimality cut coefficients are updated for subproblems

with an integer solution in Step [10]. The integrality of subproblem solutions is verified in Step [11]: if a subproblem solution for any given ω is not integral, the algorithm returns to Step [5], to generate and add Fenchel cuts to the subproblems with a non-integer solution, and compute their optimality cut coefficients. Otherwise, the incumbent solution x^* and the upper bound UB are updated in Step [12]. The optimality check is done again in Step [13]: if it is satisfied, the incumbent solution is ϵ-optimal, and the algorithm is terminated. Otherwise, the algorithm returns to Step [6], and the optimality cut is added to the master problem, and its solved again. The algorithm is continued until the termination condition is satisfied.

3.2 Fenchel Cut Generation with Reduced Integer Set

For the sake of completeness, we next present the Fenchel cut generation procedure which is based on [17]. The procedure uses a master problem to construct a linear approximation of the subproblem space while the subproblem returns feasible integer points from F_v^{IP}. The master problem is given as,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^{(t)} = \underset{\beta(\omega)\in\Pi^\beta}{\text{Max}} \quad & \theta \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & -\theta + (y(\hat{\omega}) - y(\omega)^{(\nu)})^\top \beta(\omega)^{(\nu)} \geq 0,\ \nu = 1, \cdots, t. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where the subproblem at iteration t is solved to get $y(\omega)^{(\nu)}$.

$$g(\omega, \beta(\omega)) = \underset{y(\omega)\in F_v^{IP}}{\text{Max}} \left\{\beta(\omega)^\top y(\omega)\right\}. \tag{17}$$

Solving the problems (16) and (17) iteratively will give the optimal $\beta(\omega)$ and $g(\omega, \beta(\omega))$. The algorithm is stated as follows:

Algorithm 3 Fenchel Cut Generation Procedure (FCG)

Step [1] Initialization: Set $t \leftarrow 0, \epsilon > 0, LB \leftarrow -\infty, UB \leftarrow \infty$, and get an initial point $\beta(\omega)^{(0)} \in \Pi^{\beta}$.
Step [2] Lower Bound:
Use $\beta(\omega)^{(t)}$ to solve problem (17) and get solution $y(\omega)^{(t)}$ and the corresponding objective value $g(\omega, \beta(\omega)^{(t)})$.
Compute lower bound:
Let $d^{(t)} \leftarrow (y(\hat{\omega}) - y(\omega)^{(t)})^{\top}\beta(\omega)^{(t)}$.
Set $l^{(t+1)} \leftarrow max\{d^{(t)}, l^{(t)}\}$.
if $l^{(t+1)}$ is updated **then**
Update incumbent solution:
Set $\mu \leftarrow d^{(t)}$ and $(\beta(\omega)^{*}, g(\omega, \beta(\omega)^{*})) \leftarrow (\beta(\omega)^{(t)}, g(\omega, \beta(\omega)^{(t)}))$.
end if
Use $y(\hat{\omega})$ and solution $y(\omega)^{(t)}$ from subproblem (17) to form and add constraint to the problem (16).
Step [3] Upper Bound:
Solve problem (16) to get an optimal solution $(\theta^{(t)}, \beta(\omega)^{(t)})$.
Compute upper bound:
Set $u^{(t+1)} \leftarrow min\{\theta^{(t)}, u^{(t)}\}$.
if $u^{(t+1)} - l^{(t+1)} \leq \epsilon'$ **then**
The incumbent solution is optimal.
Stop.
else
Set $t \leftarrow t + 1$ and go to [2].
end if

In Step [1] we initialize the parameters for the algorithm. Each component of $\beta(\omega)^{(0)}$ is arbitrarily initialzed to a value with their bounds. Since a subproblem integer program (3) has to be solved many times to generate Fenchel cuts, a linearly constrained domain for Π^{β} such as the L^1 unit sphere or L^2 can also be used. Step [2] uses $\beta(\omega)^{(0)}$ as coefficients, then subproblem (17) is solved, and the corresponding objective value is stored. Due to ISG, subproblem (17) can be evaluated using F_v^{IP} instead of F^{IP}. It should be noted that subproblem (17) is solved as an IP, so the solution $y(\omega)^{(t)}$ is integral. The bounds and incumbent solutions are updated in Step [2]. Based on the solution $y(\omega)^{(t)}$ from subproblem (17), the cut is added to master problem (16). In Step [3], master problem (16) is solved and the termination condition is checked. Based on the termination condition, the algorithm either stops or continues.

4 Computational Study

To gain insights into the benefits of imbedding integer set reduction into a cutting plane algorithm, we performed a computational study based on an implementation of the SFD algorithm with the option of turning on ISG. The algorithm was implemented in C++ using the CPLEX 12.5 Callable Library [15] in Microsoft Visual Studio 2010. Computations were

performed on an ACPI x64 computer with Intel®Xeon®Processor E5620 (2.4 GHz) and 12GB RAM. CPLEX MIP and LP solvers were used to optimize the master program and subproblems. Two test sets were created based on the two-stage multidimensional knapsack problem. The SFD algorithm was run to solve the test instances to optimality or stopped when a CPU time limit of 3,600 seconds (s) or 7,200s was reached. As a benchmark, the CPLEX MIP solver was applied to the deterministic equivalent problem (DEP) of each test instance. Next we describe how the multidimensional knapsack test instances were generated and then report the computational results in Section 4.2.

4.1 Test Instances Generation

We created a test problem with knapsack constraints in the first-stage, and both knapsack and assignment constraints in the second-stage. The first-stage problem is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Max } & \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} c_i^\top x_i + \mathcal{Q}_E(x) \\ \text{s.t. } & \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} x_i \leq b \\ & x_i \in \{0,1\},\ \forall i = 1 \dots n_1. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

In problem (18), $c \in \Re^{n_1}$ is the first-stage cost vector, and $b \in \Re$ is the first-stage right hand side. The function $\mathcal{Q}_E(x)$ is the expected recourse function given as

$$\mathcal{Q}_E(x) = \mathbb{E}_\omega \Phi(q(\omega), h(\omega), T(\omega)x), \tag{19}$$

where ω is a multivariate random variable and $\mathcal{Q}_E(.)$ denotes the mathematical expectation operator satisfying $\mathbb{E}_\omega [| \Phi(q(\omega), h(\omega), T(\omega)x) |] < \infty$. The underlying probability distribution of ω is discrete with a finite number of realizations (scenarios) with sample space Ω, and corresponding probabilities $p_\omega, \omega \in \Omega$. Thus for a given scenario $\omega \in \Omega$, the recourse function $\Phi(q(\omega), h(\omega), T(\omega)x)$ is given by the following second-stage MIP:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(q(\omega), h(\omega), T(\omega)x) = \text{Max } & \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} q(\omega)^{i\top} y(\omega)^i \\ \text{s.t. } & \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} w^{ij} y(\omega)^i \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} m \cdot t^i x_i \qquad \forall j = 1 \dots m_1 \\ & \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} v^{ik} y(\omega)^i \leq h(\omega)^k \qquad \forall k = 1 \dots m_2 \\ & \sum_{i=1}^{n_2} u^{i\ell} y(\omega)^i = r^\ell \qquad \forall \ell = 1 \dots m_3 \\ & 0 \leq y(\omega)^i \leq u^i, y(\omega)^i \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \qquad \forall i = 1 \dots n_2. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

In formulation (20), $y(\omega)$ is the recourse decision vector, $q(\omega) \in \Re^{n_2}$ is the recourse cost vector, $w^{ij} \in \Re^{+}$ is a fixed recourse parameter, and $t^{i} \in \Re^{+}, v^{ik} \in \Re^{+}, u^{i\ell} \in \Re^{+}$ is a parameter taking values 0 or 1, m is a constant, and $h(\omega)^{k} \in \Re^{m_2}, r^{\ell} \in \Re^{m_3}$ are the right hand side parameters. The decision vector $y(\omega)$ is bounded above by vector u. Finally, $\mathbb{Z}^{+}$ is the set of nonnegative integers. Observe that formulation (18)-(20) has knapsack constraints in both the first- and second-stages.

In a supply chain context, the first-stage decision vector x specifies the selection of facilities, mode of transportation, and/or resources. For a realization ω, the second-stage decision vector $y(\omega)$ could be the amount of products produced or transported based on the strategic decision x from the first-stage. Additionally, knapsack-type constraints are added to represent capacity limitations in the second-stage.

Test instance data were randomly generated using the uniform distribution ($\mathcal{U}$) with different parameter values. The knapsack weights were generated by sampling from $\mathcal{U}(2, 8)$. Objective function coefficients were generated with the first-stage costs chosen so that they are much larger than second-stage costs. The first- and second-stage objective function coefficients were generated by sampling from $\mathcal{U}(0, 1500)$ and $\mathcal{U}(10, 20)$, respectively. To generate tighter knapsack constraints, the right hand side value of each constraint was generated by finding the maximum knapsack weight (W_{max}) for the constraint, and then sampling from $\mathcal{U}(2 + (2W_{max} * v_{ub}), 4W_{max} * v_{ub})$, where v_{ub} is the upper bound for the integer variables. We assume that each scenario has equal probability of occurrence.

The problem characteristics are given in Table 1. The columns of the table are problem name, 'Scens' is the number of scenarios, 'Bvars' is the number of binary variables, 'Constr' is the number of constraints, and 'Nzeros' is the number of non-zero elements for each of the problem instances. The problem name has the form $k.m.n.S$, where k stands for 'knapsack', m and n is the number of first- and second-stage decision variables, respectively, and S is the number of scenarios. Two test sets, 'Set 1' and 'Set 2' were created, where the first set has relatively smaller size instances compared to the second set. Specifically, Set 1 has test instances with 10 binary and 20 general integer variables in the first- and second-stage, respectively. In this set the test instances were created for 50, 100, 150, and 200 scenarios. Set 2 has test instances with 20 binary and 30 general integer variables in the first- and second-stage, respectively. In the instances, first-stage has 10 constraints and second-stage has 20 and 30 constraints in Set 1 and Set 2, respectively. Test instances for this set were created for 500, 1,000, 1,500, and 2,000 scenarios. Five randomly generated replications were created for each instance size to avoid pathological cases.

4.2 Results

Detailed computational results for Set 1 and Set 2 are reported in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. In the tables, 'SFD' and 'SFD-R' represent the results using SFD algorithm without ISG and with ISG algorithm, respectively. In the tables the column 'Instance' is the name of the test instance. The three columns under SFD and SFD-R, respectively, are as follows: 'MIPs' is the number of MIPs solved using the respective procedure; 'FCuts' is the number of Fenchel cuts; and '%Gap' is the percentage gap between the lower bound (LB) and the

Problem	Scens	Bvars	Ivars	Constr	Nzeros
Set 1					
k.10.20.50	50	10	1,000	1,010	12,510
k.10.20.100	100	10	2,000	2,010	25,010
k.10.20.150	150	10	3,000	3,010	37,510
k.10.20.200	200	10	4,000	4,010	50,010
Set 2					
k.10.30.50	50	10	1,500	1,510	16,510
k.10.30.100	100	10	3,000	3,010	33,010
k.10.30.150	150	10	4,500	4,510	49,510
k.10.30.200	200	10	6,000	6,010	66,010

Table 1: Test instance characteristics in terms of the DEP

upper bound (UB) value after the stipulated runtime (3600s for Set 1 and 7200s for Set 2). Finally, the last column '%Gap' shows the CPLEX MIP gap after solving the DEP for the designated amount of time.

We can see from Tables 2 and 3 that none of the algorithms is able to solve any single test instance to optimality within the allotted time, an indication of the difficulty of these instances. However, both the SFD and SFD-R algorithms are able to obtain better bounds than using the direct solver applied to the DEP. In Table 2 we see that the SFD-R algorithm provides better performance on average over the SFD algorithms in terms of the percentage gap. The gains are much more significant for Set 1 than for Set 2. The results show that incorporating ISG in the SFD algorithm provides gains in gap reduction for both Set 1 and Set 2. This is an indication that reducing the integer set required for generating cuts in an SMIP algorithm can lead to better bounds for SMIP. To see the performance of each method on a given test instance, we plotted the percentage gap versus the instance in Figure 6. The graph clearly shows that the SFD-R algorithm provides the best performance overall.



Figure 6: Instances Gap (%) Runtime (Set 1 - One Hour, Set 2 - Two Hours)

We also wanted to look at the number of subproblem MIPs that were solved in the FCG routine under each algorithm. Solving more cut generation MIPs implies fast performance in terms of generating a cut. The results are shown in Figure 7, where '#MIPs' represents the number of MIPs solved using the SFD (without ISG) and SFD-R (with ISG) algorithms.

		SFD			SFD-R			CPLEX
No.	Instance	MIPs	FCuts	%Gap	MIPs	FCuts	%Gap	%Gap
1	k.10.20.50a	38,523	376	5.36	60,049	564	3.58	10.05
2	k.10.20.50b	42,435	392	4.23	59,263	539	2.86	8.83
3	k.10.20.50c	40,203	384	5.05	62,035	576	3.29	10.19
4	k.10.20.50d	37,262	360	5.43	58,391	540	3.83	9.67
5	k.10.20.50e	40,254	384	4.53	61,607	576	2.90	8.45
	Average	39,735	379	4.92	60,269	559	3.29	9.44
6	k.10.20.100a	47,567	475	5.81	68,696	665	4.65	9.12
7	k.10.20.100b	44,192	460	6.59	64,316	644	5.55	10.11
8	k.10.20.100c	44,618	460	6.56	64,468	644	5.53	10.14
9	k.10.20.100d	43,995	455	7.00	73,372	728	5.37	10.70
10	k.10.20.100e	44,661	465	6.79	65,232	651	5.50	10.73
	Average	45,006	463	6.55	67,217	666	5.32	10.16
11	k.10.20.150a	53,168	548	7.19	66,631	685	6.55	10.21
12	k.10.20.150b	52,828	544	7.16	66,095	680	6.52	9.95
13	k.10.20.150c	51,866	532	7.46	64,808	665	6.83	10.74
14	k.10.20.150d	53,372	556	7.15	67,149	695	6.48	10.78
15	k.10.20.150e	53,047	552	7.53	66,684	690	6.88	10.84
	Average	52,856	546	7.30	66,273	683	6.65	10.50
16	k.10.20.200a	51,734	549	7.91	69,173	732	7.32	10.46
17	k.10.20.200b	52,206	555	7.51	71,248	740	6.77	9.68
18	k.10.20.200c	51,164	540	8.20	68,586	720	7.48	10.73
19	k.10.20.200d	50,374	540	7.86	67,524	720	7.10	10.12
20	k.10.20.200e	52,043	555	7.88	70,003	740	7.19	10.96
	Average	51,504	547	7.87	69,307	730	7.17	10.39

Table 2: Computational Results Set1 Instances (Run Time: 3,600s)

		SFD			SFD-R			CPLEX
No.	Instance	MIPs	FCuts	%Gap	MIPs	FCuts	%Gap	%Gap
1	k.10.30.50a	22,483	482	4.04	22,542	491	3.99	4.50
2	k.10.30.50b	20,340	433	6.11	21,935	466	5.31	4.59
3	k.10.30.50c	24,807	529	4.29	25,086	538	3.96	5.84
4	k.10.30.50d	24,432	563	4.10	27,025	592	3.37	5.80
5	k.10.30.50e	24,339	520	3.70	25,009	520	3.04	4.80
	Average	23,280	505	4.45	24,319	521	3.94	5.11
6	k.10.30.100a	27,073	566	4.40	27,452	571	1.04	4.46
7	k.10.30.100b	24,476	624	9.98	26,141	664	6.16	12.40
8	k.10.30.100c	18,711	308	0.86	18,816	313	0.86	6.21
9	k.10.30.100d	26,375	548	6.06	26,663	565	5.97	9.06
10	k.10.30.100e	25,193	550	4.53	26,985	603	2.15	5.55
	Average	24,366	519	5.17	25,211	543	3.24	7.54
11	k.10.30.150a	26,940	739	6.38	27,675	762	5.01	10.78
12	k.10.30.150b	28,677	646	4.66	28,722	651	4.66	8.46
13	k.10.30.150c	24,328	549	7.40	24,333	558	3.65	5.13
14	k.10.30.150d	27,645	611	4.12	29,178	789	1.10	4.54
15	k.10.30.150e	25,312	552	4.28	26,383	582	4.21	12.63
	Average	26,580	619	5.37	27,258	668	3.73	8.31
16	k.10.30.200a	25,817	592	5.21	26,833	610	2.87	4.48
17	k.10.30.200b	27,392	605	4.35	27,944	618	3.62	4.45
18	k.10.30.200c	24,211	555	7.50	25,187	584	7.45	9.45
19	k.10.30.200d	25,471	600	5.16	26,097	609	3.78	7.20
20	k.10.30.200e	24,882	570	8.00	25,884	595	7.98	8.78
	Average	25,555	584	6.04	26,389	603	5.14	6.87

Table 3: Computational Results Set2 Instances (Run Time: 7,200s)

The results clearly show that the SFD-R algorithm solves relatively more MIPs, and thus generates more FD cuts (Figure 8), than the SFD algorithm. Finally, we should point out that the larger size test instances (Set 2) generally requires more cuts than the smaller size test instances (Set 1).



Figure 7: # MIPs Solved



Figure 8: # Fenchel Cuts

5 Conclusion

This work introduces a new integer set reduction procedure for cutting plane methods for SMIP with general integer variables in the second-stage. Example illustrations of the new method in the context of generating Fenchel cutting planes are given. The method is then incorporated into the Fenchel decomposition algorithm for SMIP and a computational study is performed to assess the benefits of the new approach. The results from the computational study show that incorporating integer set reduction in the Fenchel decomposition method leads in having better bounds and provides better performance than a direct solver applied to the deterministic equivalent problem. Also, more cuts are generated in a given time period when integer set reduction is used as opposed to when it is not used. Future work along this line of work include extending the integer set reduction procedure to SMIP with arbitrary or general recourse matrices. Another extension is to incorporate and evaluate the new procedure in other cutting plane methods for SMIP such as disjunctive decomposition and dual decomposition.

References

[1] Egon Balas, Sebastián Ceria, and Gérard Cornuéjols. A lift-and-project cutting plane algorithm for mixed 0–1 programs. *Mathematical Programming*, 58(1-3):295–324, 1993.

[2] Eric Beier, Saravanan Venkatachalam, Luca Corolli, and Lewis Ntaimo. Stage-and scenario-wise fenchel decomposition for stochastic mixed 0-1 programs with special structure. *Computers & Operations Research*, 59:94–103, 2015.

[3] Eric Beier, Saravanan Venkatachalam, V Jorge Leon, and Lewis Ntaimo. Nodal decomposition–coordination for stochastic programs with private information restrictions. *IIE Transactions*, pages 1–15, 2015.

[4] Jacques F Benders. Partitioning procedures for solving mixed-variables programming problems. *Numerische Mathematik*, 4(1):238–252, 1962.

[5] Charles E Blair and Robert G Jeroslow. The value function of an integer program. *Mathematical Programming*, 23(1):237–273, 1982.

[6] Maurizio Boccia, Antonio Sforza, Claudio Sterle, and Igor Vasilyev. A cut and branch approach for the capacitated p-median problem based on fenchel cutting planes. *Journal of Mathematical Modelling and Algorithms*, 7(1):43–58, 2008.

[7] Andrew E Boyd. Generating fenchel cutting planes for knapsack polyhedra. *Siam Journal on Optimization*, 3(4):734–750, 1993.

[8] Andrew E Boyd. Solving integer programs with fenchel cutting planes and preprocessing. In *IPCO*, pages 209–220, 1993.

[9] Andrew E Boyd. Fenchel cutting planes for integer programs. *Operations Research*, 42(1):53–64, 1994.

[10] Andrew E Boyd. Solving 0/1 integer programs with enumeration cutting planes. *Annals of Operations Research*, 50(1):61–72, 1994.

[11] Andrew E Boyd. On the convergence of fenchel cutting planes in mixed-integer programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 5(2):421–435, 1995.

[12] Claus C Carøe and Jørgen Tind. A cutting-plane approach to mixed 0–1 stochastic integer programs. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 101(2):306–316, 1997.

[13] Luca Corolli, Guglielmo Lulli, Lewis Ntaimo, and Saravanan Venkatachalam. A two-stage stochastic integer programming model for air traffic flow management. *IMA Journal of Management Mathematics*, page dpv017, 2015.

[14] George B Dantzig and Curtis B Eaves. Fourier-motzkin elimination and its dual. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 14(3):288–297, 1973.

[15] IBM ILOG CPLEX. IBM ILOG CPLEX callable library version 12.1 C API reference manual. *International Business Machines Corporation*, 2009.

[16] L. Ntaimo. Fenchel decomposition for two-stage stochastic mixed-integer programming. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 55:141–163, 2013.

[17] Lewis Ntaimo. Fenchel decomposition for stochastic mixed-integer programming. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 55(1):141–163, 2013.

[18] MT Ramos and Jesús Sáez. Solving capacitated facility location problems by fenchel cutting planes. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 56(3):297–306, 2005.

[19] Jesús Sáez. Solving linear programming relaxations associated with lagrangean relaxations by fenchel cutting planes. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 121(3):609–626, 2000.

[20] Rüdiger Schultz. Continuity properties of expectation functions in stochastic integer programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 18(3):578–589, 1993.

[21] Suvrajeet Sen and Julia L Higle. The c 3 theorem and a d 2 algorithm for large scale stochastic mixed-integer programming: set convexification. *Mathematical Programming*, 104(1):1–20, 2005.

[22] Suvrajeet Sen and Hanif D Sherali. Decomposition with branch-and-cut approaches for two-stage stochastic mixed-integer programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 106(2):203–223, 2006.

[23] Hanif D Sherali and Warren P Adams. *A Reformulation-Linearization Technique for Solving Discrete and Continuous Nonconvex Problems*, volume 31. Springer, New York, 1998.

[24] Hanif D Sherali and Barbara MP Fraticelli. A modification of benders' decomposition algorithm for discrete subproblems: An approach for stochastic programs with integer recourse. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 22(1-4):319–342, 2002.

[25] Richard M Van Slyke and Roger Wets. L-shaped linear programs with applications to optimal control and stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 17(4):638–663, 1969.

[26] Saravanan Venkatachalam. *Algorithms for Stochastic Integer Programs Using Fenchel Cutting Planes*. PhD thesis, 2014.

[27] Richard D Wollmer. Two stage linear programming under uncertainty with 0–1 integer first stage variables. *Mathematical Programming*, 19(1):279–288, 1980.